1

Ground One: New evidence shows that he is innocent because (a) the 2 victim told a third party that she had inflicted the injuries on herself in 3 an attempt to gain permanent residency status under the Violence 4 Against Women Act, and (b) an expert witness could identify the injuries as self-inflicted. (Dkt. 2 ["Memo"] at 5-8.) 5 Ground Two: The prosecutor committed misconduct by (a) stating 6 7 facts not in evidence during closing argument, and (b) telling the 8 Irvine Police Department to stop investigating Petitioner's case. (Memo at 8-11.) 9 10 Ground Three: Petitioner's trial counsel was ineffective for (a) failing to introduce evidence of the victim's motive to lie (i.e., the 11 12 immigration concerns), (b) failing to investigate whether fingerprint 13 evidence on the recovered weapon would have exonerated Petitioner, 14 and (c) failing to adequately attack the credibility of the victim. 15 (Memo at 12-26.) Ground Four: Petitioner's due process rights were violated because 16 17 the "verdict was decided by a means other than a fair expression of 18 opinion on the part of all the jurors" under California Penal Code 19 section 1181, subd. 4, because (a) one juror fell asleep during the trial, 20 (b) the jury initially indicated it could not reach a verdict during 21 deliberations, and (c) the jurors were not polled. (Memo at 27-28.) 22 In May 2019, the Court stayed this action under Rhines v. Weber, 544 U.S. 269 (2005) so that Petitioner could finish exhausting his claims in the state courts. 23 24 (Dkt. 13.) At the time, he was still pursuing a direct appeal of his convictions. In 25 October 2019, the California Court of Appeal issued an opinion affirming his convictions (case no. G055893). Petitioner then sought review in the California 26 27 Supreme Court (case no. S259197). On January 22, 2020, that court granted his petition for review but deferred further action until a related issue was decided in 28

another case. This Court directed Petitioner to file a status report within 60 days after final disposition of his petition for review. (Dkt. 20.)

While that petition for review remained pending, Petitioner sought relief in the Superior Court under California Penal Code section 1203.4.<sup>2</sup> On April 18, 2021, the Superior Court granted Petitioner relief and dismissed "all felony convictions" and "all misdemeanor convictions" against him in the case. (Dkt. 32-1.) Thus, Petitioner appears to have completed his period of probation.

On November 16, 2022, the California Supreme Court dismissed Petitioner's petition for review. See California Appellate Courts Case Information, Supreme Court Case No. S259197. Petitioner timely filed a status report informing the Court of this and asking to proceed with his Petition. (Dkt. 32.)

12 //

13 //

14 //

15 //

"Section 1203.4 provides that a defendant who 'has fulfilled the conditions of probation for the entire period of probation, *or* has been discharged prior to the termination of the period of probation' ... is entitled as a matter of right to have the plea or verdict changed to not guilty, to have the proceedings expunged from the record, and to have the accusations dismissed. ... A grant of relief under section 1203.4 is intended to reward an individual who successfully completes probation by mitigating some of the consequences of his conviction and, with a few exceptions, to restore him to his former status in society to the extent the Legislature has power to do so.... However, such relief "does not, properly speaking, 'expunge' the prior conviction. The statute does not purport to render the conviction a legal nullity." People v. E.B., 51 Cal. App. 5th 47, 54 (2020) (citations omitted).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The dismissal order was entered by the Los Angeles County Superior Court case no. YA098900, rather than the Orange County Superior Court case no. 16HF0902, because his "case was transferred to Los Angeles County Superior Court while he was on probation" under California Penal Code section 1203.9. (Dkt. 32-2 [Orange County Superior Court order denying Petitioner's motion under California Penal Code section 1203.4 on this basis].)

1 || II.

## 2 DISCUSSION

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the **stay of this action is lifted**, and in order to facilitate the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of this action, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED as follows:

- 1. Regardless of whether Respondent chooses to file a Motion to Dismiss or Answer (as discussed further below), Respondent's briefing should address whether or not the Petition is now moot. Petitioner appears to argue it is not moot because, although he "applied for and was granted a statutory reduction of charges and dismissal," he "remain[s] bereft of [his] 2nd [A]mendment rights to own firearms," "prospective employers still see the conviction," and he "was denied a visa for Canada." (Dkt. 32 at 2); see generally Spencer v. Kemna, 523 U.S. 1, 7 (1998) ("Once the convict's sentence has expired, ... some concrete and continuing injury other than the now-ended incarceration or parole—some 'collateral consequence' of the conviction—must exist if the [habeas] suit is to be maintained."); see also Demery v. Arpaio, 378 F.3d 1020, 1025 (9th Cir. 2004) (noting that the court had "an independent duty to consider sua sponte whether a case is moot").
- 2. If Respondent contends that the Petition can be decided without the Court reaching the merits of Petitioner's claims (e.g., because Respondent contends that the Petition is moot, or that Petitioner has failed to exhaust state remedies as to any ground for relief alleged in the Petition), Respondent shall file a Motion to Dismiss within thirty (30) days of the service date of this Order. The Motion to Dismiss shall not address the merits of Petitioner's claims, but rather shall be confined to the basis for Respondent's contention that dismissal without reaching the merits of Petitioner's claims is warranted.<sup>3</sup> At the time the Motion to Dismiss is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> If Respondent contends that some or all of Petitioner's claims are procedurally defaulted, such contention should not be made in a Motion to Dismiss,

filed, Respondent shall lodge with the Court all records bearing on Respondent's contention in this regard.

- 3. If Respondent files a Motion to Dismiss, Petitioner shall file his opposition, if any, to the Motion within twenty (20) days of the date of service thereof. At the time the opposition is filed, Petitioner shall lodge with the Court any records not lodged by Respondent which Petitioner believes may be relevant to the Court's determination of the Motion.
- 4. Unless the Court orders otherwise, Respondent shall <u>not</u> file a Reply to Petitioner's opposition to a Motion to Dismiss. If the Motion is denied, the Court will afford Respondent adequate time to answer Petitioner's claims on the merits.
- 5. If Respondent does not contend that the Petition can be decided without the Court reaching the merits of Petitioner's claims, then Respondent shall file and serve an Answer to the Petition within forty-five (45) days of the service date of this Order. At the time the Answer is filed, Respondent shall lodge with the Court all records bearing on the merits of Petitioner's claims, including the briefs specified in Rule 5(d) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts. The Answer shall also specifically address the necessity for an evidentiary hearing to resolve any issue.
- 6. Petitioner may file a single Reply responding to matters raised in the Answer within thirty (30) days of the date of service thereof. Any Reply filed by Petitioner shall: (a) state whether Petitioner admits or denies each allegation of fact contained in the Answer; (b) be limited to facts or arguments responsive to matters raised in the Answer; and (c) not raise new grounds for relief that were not asserted

but rather should be made in an Answer to the Petition which addresses the allegedly defaulted claims on the merits in the alternative. If Respondent's Motion to Dismiss contends that Petitioner has failed to exhaust any state remedies as to any ground for relief alleged in the Petition, Respondent shall also specify the state remedies still available to Petitioner.

- in the Petition. Grounds for relief raised for the first time in the Reply will not be considered, unless the Court grants Petitioner leave to amend the Petition. No Reply shall exceed twenty (20) pages in length absent advance leave of Court for good cause shown.

  7. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, this case shall be deemed
- 7. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, this case shall be deemed submitted on the day following the date Petitioner's opposition to a Motion to Dismiss and/or Petitioner's Reply is due.
- 8. To request an extension of time for any of the deadlines set forth in this Order, a party must file a motion demonstrating good cause for the extension. Such a motion should be filed before the deadline has expired. Any such motion should be accompanied by a declaration explaining why an extension of time is necessary and by a proposed order granting the requested extension.
- 9. Every document delivered to the Court must include a certificate of service attesting that a copy of such document was served on opposing counsel (or on the opposing party, if such party is not represented by counsel). Any document delivered to the Court without a certificate of service may be returned to the submitting party without being considered by the Court.
- 10. Petitioner shall immediately notify the Court and counsel for Respondent of any change of Petitioner's address. If Petitioner fails to keep the Court informed of where Petitioner may be contacted, this action may be dismissed for failure to prosecute. See Local Rule 41-6.

DATED: December 1, 2022

KAREN E. SCOTT
United States Magistrate Judge